

✓ line 2, change "segment" to -packet-.

✓ Claim 26, line 1, change "21" to -25-.

✓ Claim 27, line 1, change "20" to -24-.

✓ Claim 28, line 2, change "20" to -24-.

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Amendments, and Objection and Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112[1]

In light of the foregoing amendments, the objections and rejections to the claims are believed to have been overcome and should now be withdrawn. The Examiner's consideration of the claims is appreciated, and the various typographical errors and grammatical inconsistencies are regretted.

Many of the Examiner's suggested amendments have been adopted and the claims have been so amended. Nevertheless, various other suggested amendments have not been adopted because they are not believed to have warranted rejection. For example, "the casing" in line 2 of claims 1 and 10, and "the rotating shaft" in lines 7-8 of claim 5, need not have an explicit antecedent basis if the scope of the claim as written would be ascertainable to one of ordinary skill in the art. MPEP 2173.05(e). One of ordinary skill in these art clearly understands the general structure of a compressor or turbine, that it includes a casing with a rotating shaft, various seals, and the like.

In claim 5, the antecedent for "said opposing surfaces" in lines 22-23 is the term "opposite" at line 20.

The suggested changes noted in the bottom half of page 4 of the Examiner's communication are not understood and clarification is requested. Nevertheless, it is likely that most, if not all, have been addressed by the present amendments.

The claims following claim 24 should have been dependent thereon, and have been amended accordingly.

In light of the foregoing, these rejections should now be withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejections

Various claims have been rejected as anticipated by Turnquist *et al.* or obvious thereover in combination with previously cited patent references.


The present application is a divisional of a parent application filed 11 July 1997. Turnquist *et al.* was filed 10 August 1998, and so is not citable as prior art.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of all of the rejections, and further and favorable action, in the form of a Notice of Allowance, are believed to be next in order, and such actions are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Bradley N. Ruben, Reg. No. 32,058
Hopgood, Calimafde,
Kalil & Judlowe L.L.P.
60 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10165
212-551-5000 ext. 4181
fax 212-949-2795
16 March 2000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION – 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that I have a reasonable basis that this paper, along with any referred to above, (i) are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or (ii) are being transmitted to the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.8(d).

DATE: 17 March 2000

NAME: Heather A. McLennand

SIGNATURE: Heather A. McLennand